Witch Hunt Bulletin From Capitol Hill: Brownell's Blitzkrieg, Page 3

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. 2, NUMBER 25 JULY 12, 1954 WASHINGTON, D. C. 15 CENTS

Knowland's Threat Is Against Eisenhower

There has been so much merriment, of the hollow ha-ha variety, about Knowland's threat to resign as majority leader if Red China is admitted to the UN, that too little attention has been paid its real significance. The threat to resign is not aimed at our Western allies but at the White House. It is Eisenhower on whom Knowland has served warning.

Knowland threatened to resign as majority leader because he feared an unspoken understanding in the Churchill-Eisenhower talks for Peking's admission to the UN. The U.S. would look the other way, as in Indo-China, making gestures of resistance, but in the end acquiescing. Thus by a combination of force and gentle cluckings, a slightly cracked old Uncle Sam would be led to make some adjustment to the realities of international life. The new British diplomacy would be to pat our hand during the operation and say, "There, there . . ."

McCarran Rang The Alarm

The Knowland threat becomes clearer if one looks at the little noticed speech McCarran made in the Senate the day Churchill was being interviewed here at his press luncheon.

The most important part of the speech was not its criticism of the British but its warning about the Eisenhower Administration. "There are those in authority in the United States today," McCarran said, "including some in what might be termed the middle echelon of the Department of State, and possibly also in the middle echelon of the White House as well, who are still seeking recognition by the United States for the Communist overlords of China." McCarran did not place these "middle echelons" more precisely, nor name names.

But earlier in the speech the China Lobby's most astute spokesman did touch in passing on someone who might be described as in that "middle echelon." McCarran said, "It is significant, I think, that in his speech to the House of Commons, Mr. Eden warmly and equally praised Gen. Walter Bedell Smith, United States Under Secretary of State, and Mr. Molotov, the Soviet Foreign Minister, for their aid at Geneva."

"Obviously," McCarran went on, "Mr. Eden feels that both General Smith and Mr. Molotov aided him, and that they aided him in substantially the same degree. It is not thinkable," McCarran continued, thinking it aloud, "that he could have meant that Mr. Smith and Mr. Molotov were working for the same objectives."

This must be read against the background of the China Lobby's vendetta with General Marshall. Smith, like Eisenhower, is a Marshall protege. He is much closer to the President than Dulles and one of the objectives of the China Lobby has been to cast enough doubt on Smith to make it politically impossible for him to become Dulles' successor as Secretary of State. The report on "Interlocking Subversion in Government Departments" issued by the Internal Security Committee of the Senate last summer sideswiped Smith. The chairman of that committee is Marshall's detractor, Jenner, and its ranking Democrat is McCarran.

Why They Want to Probe CIA

One of the reasons the China Lobby crowd has been itching to bring CIA (Central Intelligence Agency) within the orbit of the Congressional witch hunt is because of the opportunity this would afford to smear Smith, who was long head of CIA. One of CIA's functions is to act as the private news agency of the White House, briefing the President daily on the world situation. This gives it great influence, since policy is often made on the basis of the facts as CIA presents it.

In the light of this it is important to call attention to an unnoticed passage in a second speech McCarran made to the Senate last week. This was shortly after Knowland's threat to resign and it accompanied McCarran's introduction of a resolution, S.J. Res. 171, directing the President to withdraw the U.S. from all United Nations organizations and functions if Communist China were admitted to the UN.

McCarran began by saying there was a plan to bring Peking into the General Assembly after Congress had adjourned. He declared that while he was "confident" that the President does not favor this, "yet I am afraid he will be overpersuaded on this matter, and permit the United States to assent, or to remain silent, while this Communist coup is completed." McCarran said he was also "confident" of Dulles's position. But "I gravely fear," he went on, "that Mr. Dulles will not demonstrate the courage of his convictions if too many others in the administration take a different viewpoint."

At this point McCarran went on to make what seems to be a veiled reference to the CIA. This may further elucidate his cryptic remarks about the "middle echelons" which favor admission of Red China to the UN. "I think," he told the Senate, (Con. Rec. July 1, p. 9061), "there is grave danger that the National Security Council may be persuaded, by those to whom it listens most carefully *and who have the largest share in preparing and filtering the language of its pronouncements* [italics added, IFS]; and on the basis of such persuasion, may counsel that the Chinese Communists" be admitted to the UN.

The Threat of a New Investigation

It is the CIA, now under Dulles's brother, Allen W. Dulles, which briefs the National Security Council. Somewhere in the "middle echelons" of CIA and White House, the language of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

National Security Council pronouncements is prepared and, to use McCarran's well chosen word, "filtered." Now if one turns back to the speech a few days earlier, in which McCarran first sounded the alarm, one will see the shadow of his strategy for the future.

McCarran ended that first speech by warning the Senate (Con. Rec. June 28, p. 8592) to "beware of the attitude which is being assumed more and more of those in important posts in Government, the attitude of scoffing at the danger presented by that group who are security risks in Government jobs." McCarran said this attitude ignored the "established fact that it was through the advice and machinations of security risks in Government jobs that the destruction of Nationalist China was brought about." This was the "fact" as "established" by the Internal Security Committee's investigation of the Institute of Pacific Relations when McCarran was its chairman.

McCarran then proceeded to an oblique warning for the White House. "Let it not be forgotten," he advised, "that because of this group of security risks in Government jobs, a program and a policy favorable to Communist aims in China, and prepared initially by a conscious articulate agent of the Soviet conspiracy was presented to a President of the United States."

The G.O.P., Too, Is "Infiltrated"

"Never think for a moment," McCarran concluded, "that an American President accepted a program favorable to the Communists, knowing that it was a program favorable to the Communists, or knowing that it was Communist inspired."

McCarran thus absolved Truman while warning Eisenhower. "Never forget for a moment," he went on, "that Communist planners have not ceased to plan, and that Communist agents continue to work deviously and with fiendish cleverness for the attainment of the long-range objectives of the world Communist conspiracy." And then he ended by expressing the view that the G.O.P., too, was infiltrated. "Do not doubt for a moment," McCarran finished, "that communism still has its servants and dupes in high places."

This speech and its implications are to be taken seriously. They assert—and no Republican rose in the Senate to deny it—that after 18 months in office the new Administration, like its Democratic predecessor and despite promises of a cleanup, still had in its "high places" the "servants and dupes" of the Communists. The prospect of admitting Red China to the UN was portrayed as a "new tragedy" which would be due to their handiwork. That this came from McCarran, the Senate's ablest if not its noisiest Inquisitor, was notice that unless the Administration fought hard against Peking's admission, it would be investigated and smeared in its turn.

This is the atmosphere in which national policy on China must be made. This, too, clarifies the standards embodied in and the purposes achieved by the concept of a "security risk." Anyone who dares advocate recognition of realities in the Far East is in danger of being regarded as a security risk, and a possible Communist conspirator. This is the mechanism by which Chiang's rump regime on Formosa wields in Washington the power it lost in Asia. The American civil servant quails before a power of which the Chinese peasant has rid himself. It is Washington which now wears the pigtail.

Eisenhower for Co-Existence

Talk of co-existence has touched a vital nerve in Washington because it means co-existence with Communist China and must lead eventually to its recognition and admission to the US—either, that, or war. And what has alarmed McCarran and Knowland and those who are reconciled to war is that Eisenhower basically, and to a greater extent than Truman and Acheson, is prepared to accept co-existence. This was evident, despite talk of not appeasing and not making anybody a slave, in his July 1 press conference, the day before Knowland's threat to quit. The President's answer to a question about the possibilities of co-existence wobbled and wiggled but ended by saying, we have got to find ways of living together. This moves in an entirely different direction from the Truman-Acheson "total diplomacy," which was based on the premise that co-existence was impractical and unacceptable and that the only way out was to build up to such strength that the Russians must either surrender or be crushed. Mutual possession of the H-bomb has made this more than ever a fantasy. And Eisenhower knows it.

Eisenhower uses the cliches necessary in the current atmosphere, but they mean little in practice except to keep the public (and himself) confused. Thus in the wake of his remark about not being a party to any treaty making anybody a slave, he was asked—but denied—that this meant he would not cooperate in any way with an armistice that partitions Vietnam. Yet partition of Vietnam, in this vocabulary, means that part of its people will become "slaves." (The rest presumably continue in a happy state of freedom as coolies for the Bank of Indo-China.)

Again the Democrats Must Save Him

For the China Lobby crowd, it looks more than ever like the last chance to prevent the liquidation of the Chiang regime. A bipartisan alliance is at work, in which McCarthy refreshed may soon be expected to figure. The atmosphere is so bad that only Lehman and Morse had the nerve to challenge Knowland and his new lieutenant, the Democratic leader, Lyndon Johnson of Texas. But the speech of George last Tuesday was a reminder that the situation was not quite as serious as it appeared when both parties in the Senate seemed to be speaking in one voice.

Lyndon Johnson, like Knowland, fulfills the technical details which devolve on party leadership in the Senate but neither "leads" his party colleagues in the normal sense of the word. Neither has the prestige, seniority, capacity or force for that. George, on the other hand, is one of the natural leaders of the Democratic party and indeed on some issues of both parties in the Senate at this time. Like Lehman and Morse, he did not dare go beyond the pale and favor recognition of realities in the Far East. Like them, he merely opposed American withdrawal from the UN if China were admitted. This Southern conservative has been one of the main influences against military involvement in Indo-China, and behind him enough votes can certainly be mustered to defeat the McCarran resolution or any similar moves by Knowland. But this may be the beginning of a split in the Republican party in which the wild men may try to take the reins away from Eisenhower whom they mistrust and despise.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Witch Hunt Bulletin from Capitol Hill

Brownell's Blitzkrieg To Avoid Public Hearings

Capitol Hill—The Senate Judiciary Committee was slated to open public hearings last Thursday (July 8) on the Brownell bills to liquidate "Communist-infiltrated" organizations and to set up a blacklist of "subversives" in industry. The Attorney General, who has never testified on his own bills, despite their revolutionary character, was to be invited to appear and to answer questions about them.

Two days before the hearings were to have been held, Brownell took the unusual step of appearing before an executive session of the Committee. Of the five members reported to be against his bills, Hennings (D., Mo.), Johnston (D., S. Car.), Hendrickson (R., N. J.), Kilgore (D., W. Va.) and Langer (R., S. D.), only the latter was present.

As a result of the Attorney General's surprise appearance, the majority voted to call off hearings and to report the Brownell "Communist-infiltrated' bill in amended form. This was a partial defeat for the Attorney General, since the bill as reported next day did not give him the power he had originally requested to name a receiver for and to liquidate any business, trade union or other organization he believed to be "Communist-infiltrated."

Instead the bill (S 3706) would add a new chapter to the McCarran Act, the Subversive Activities Control Board Act of 1950. At present this Act provides for the registration of "Communist action" and "Communist front" organizations and for the "yellow badge" labelling of publications and broadcasts under their auspices. The new bill would bring under the same provisions any "organization" which was "infiltrated," though not necessarily dominated or controlled by the Communists.

As we went to press, the text of the bill had not yet been printed but the committee report (No. 1709) was available. From it at the bottom of this page we reprint the standards the bill would establish for determining whether an organization was "Communist infiltrated."

This bill would vastly enlarge the inquisitorial orbit of the Subversive Activities Control Board. It would give the Board power to deny collective bargaining privileges to "infiltrated" unions—the principal original purpose. But it is so sweepingly written that any organization or publication which has aided causes also supported by the Communists would be endangered.

At the very least this bill would give the Board authority to hail before it any trade unionist, business man, social worker, or newspaperman to determine whether there was "Communist infiltration" in his organization. It could thus extend the witch hunt into many fields Congressional committees have hesitated to enter because their power to do so is doubtful.

A trade union, publication, organization or business would be subject to the sanctions and liabilities of the Subversive Activities Control Board if at any time within five years it had been "Communist infiltrated." It would have to wear the "yellow badge" of registration and labelling as "Communist infiltrated." This would be enough in most cases to drive it out of business.

The bill, according to the report, would lay the groundwork for sensational "mass trials" since it would permit the Attorney General to try "two or more affiliated organizations to be named as joint respondents." Thus also the sinister reputation of one could be used to reflect on others.

The main effect of the bill would be to destroy left-wing unions, and to put other unions on notice that to support any radical or pacifist cause was dangerous, since this might be adduced as evidence of "parallelism" and "infiltration." The same goes for publications and businesses. That these provisions may easily be used later against any kind of militant trade-unionism is recognized by CIO and A.F. of L., both of which are on record against this type of legislation. Unfortunately their battle against it has been lukewarm because they see it as a means of eliminating left-wing rivals.

Only a last-minute fight in the Senate, so determined that it would threaten other business, can block this police-state legislation now. Write or wire your Senator.

How "Communist-Infiltration" Would Be Determined

"In making such determinations with respect to any organization, the Board would be required to take into account—

"(1) the extent to which the effective management of the affairs of such organization is conducted by one or more individuals who are, or within five years have been, (A) members, agents, or representatives of any Communist organization, any Communist foreign government, or the world Communist movement referred to in section 2 of this title, with knowledge of the nature and purpose thereof, or (B) engaged in giving aid or support to any such organization, government, or movement with knowledge of the nature and purpose thereof;

"(2) the extent to which the policies of such organization are, or within five years have been, formulated and carried out pursuant to the direction or advice of any member, agent or representative of any such organization, government or movement.

"(3) the extent to which the personnel and resources of such organization are, or within five years have been, used to further or promote the objectives of any such Communist organization, government or movement;

"(4) the extent to which such organization within 5 years has received from, or furnished to or for the use of, any such Communist organization, government or movement any funds or other material assistance;

"(5) the extent to which such organization is, or within five years has been, affiliated in any other way with any such Communist organization, government or movement;

"(6) the extent to which the affiliation of such organization, or of any individual or individuals who are members or who manage its affairs, with any such Communist organizaton, government or movement is concealed from or is not disclosed to the membership of such organization: and

"(7) the extent to which such organization or any of its members or managers are, or within five years have been knowingly engaged—

"(A) in any conduct punishable under Section 4 or 15 of this act or under chapter 37, 105, or 115 of title 18 of the U.S. Code; or

"(B) with intent to impair the military strength of the United States or its industrial capacity to furnish logistical or other support required by its Armed Forces, in any activity resulting in or contributing to such impairment.

"Sections 4 and 15 of the act, referred to in subparagraph (7) (A) of the foregoing standards, prescribe criminal penalties for the violation of substantive provisions contained in the [Internal Security] Act. Chapters 37, 105, and 115 of title 18 of the U.S. Code . . . are penal in nature and are entitled respectively 'Espionage and Censorship,' 'Sabotage,' and 'Treason,' Sedition and Subversive Activities.'"

—*Mr. Butler, from the Senate Committee on the Judiciary (Report No. 1709) to accompany S 8706, to amend the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950 to provide for the determination of the identity of Communist-infiltrated organizations.*

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Round A (Woozy) Capitol and An (Unsteady) Globe

A Justice Department source says that Paul Crouch is "through" as a government informer, but is silent on perjury action . . . The State Department played it dirty when officials claimed the U.S. was not informed about French plans to withdraw from the southern part of the Red River delta; the plans were approved in advance by Gen. O'Daniel, head of the U.S. Military mission in Indo-China . . . The decision to file the anti-trust suit against United Fruit was political, timed with an eye to Guatemala. At the rate that the Justice Department is handing out consent decrees in Sherman Act cases, United Fruit has nothing to fear . . .

"Warmed over spy" was promised as pre-election bill of fare, but none has been quite as often warmed over as Jenner's new investigation into the Army's World War II Information and Education branch of whose anti-racist pamphlets John Rankin used to complain . . . One of the horrendous revelations at the opening of the hearings last week dealt with a "GI Plan for Postwar America" broached by students at a convalescent hospital in Camp Pickett, Virginia. A Baltimore insurance man then employed by counter-intelligence testified that he spotted it as Red . . . A look at the document itself showed that on atomic energy what these "Reds" advocated was strict international control, ownership and inspection of atomic energy, i.e., the Baruch plan . . . Senator Jenner seemed very suspicious of the fact that one witness, Luke Wilson, had no visible means of support, wanted to know if he got money from subversive sources . . . The committee's tireless researchers did not seem to realize the witness was heir to one of Washington's great department store fortunes . . . Probably because this never appeared in the *Daily Worker* . . .

We nominate for shipment to one of the Soviet Union's worser and colder labor camps the bureaucrat who "sat on" a visa requested by Mrs. Roosevelt for a writer to accompany her on her projected Russian tour . . . They wouldn't take the responsibility of refusing the visa but failed to say either "da" or "nyet" . . . Mrs. Roosevelt finally called off her trip in protest when she couldn't get an answer, and we don't blame her . . . Plain clunk-headed rudeness of this kind has hurt Russian relations with the outside world for a long time, and if there is to be a "new look" it is time the Soviet bureaucracy took a good new look at itself . . .

Adenauer in his latest declared the German people had "convincingly demonstrated their reliability" and then went on to say that unless EDC was ratified the result would be a German national army, and "we, as so many others, believe this would unquestionably lead to German militarism." How reliable are they, if they can so easily slip into militarism again? Even the State Department's European experts allowed themselves a quiet *moue* over that one . . .

The Hanoi correspondent of the *Sunday Times* (June 27) of London presented quite a different picture, said the Viet Namese nationalists "are convinced that, left to their own devices, they could settle with the Viet Minh" . . . "Nobody here pretends," he wrote, "that if elections were held now the Vietnamese Nationalists could win. But they themselves believe that, once freed from the French, they could capitalize on the traditional fear of China and natural anti-Communism to win the people to their side. Furthermore," he added, "they do not dread the emergence of a Ho Chi-minh regime, for the Nationalists and the Viet-Minh alike regard Ho Chi-minh as the one statesman of stature their country has produced . . .

The new Guatemalan regime has hit on the way to safeguard Latin American regimes from "subversion"—take the right to vote away from the illiterate, i.e., the majority of the people, and jail the "Reds," i.e., the intellectuals . . . The unkindest cut of all in Washington was New Zealand's stand for admission of Red China to the UN . . . Hats off to the one newspaper publisher in America who protested the shipment back to Formosa of that Chinese Marine who had asked asylum here, declaring that he did not wish to go back to Chiang's police state . . . Said in an editorial that Washington was as embarrassed as Taipeh since "we have been pouring military and economic aid into Formosa and acclaiming Chiang as a great exponent of the 'democracy' of the 'free world'" . . . The publisher was Colonel McCormick and the editorial appeared last Wednesday, July 7, in the *Chicago Tribune* . . .

Of all the organizations and witnesses to appear in the hearings being held by the Senate Rules Committee on the reform of Congressional investigations only the Friends attacked the principle of Inquisition-by-Committee. Wilmer A. Cooper for the Friends said they seriously question "whether congressional committees should inquire into the opinions and beliefs of individuals except in cases involving Senatorial confirmation of appointments . . . It is a fundamental right in American democracy that one can exercise freedom of thought without fear of punishment for the ideas he holds" . . . This, and not the question of procedure, is the issue . . . The evils of the Spanish Inquisition would not have ended by forcing Torquemada to be more polite . . .

Let Us Send A Sample Copy Free To Your Friends

I. F. Stone's Weekly, 301 E. Capitol, Wash. 3, D. C.

Please renew (or enter) my sub for the enclosed $5:

Name .....

Street .....

City ..... Zone ..... State .....

Enter this gift sub for $4 more (money enclosed):

(To) Name .....

Street .....

City ..... Zone ..... State .....

7-12-54

I. F. Stone's Weekly

Room 205

301 E. Capitol St., S.E.

Washington 3, D. C.

NEWSPAPER

Entered as Second Class Mail Matter Washington, D. C. Post Office

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED